



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2003

| PPLICATION NO.                        | FILING DATE    | . FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 09/590,641                            | 06/08/2000     | Masahide Maruyama      | 21778.03800           | 1033            |
| 7:                                    | 590 07/11/2003 |                        |                       |                 |
| Adam H Tachner                        |                |                        | EXAMINER              |                 |
| Crosby Heafet Roach & May PO Box 7936 |                |                        | COLILLA, DANIEL JAMES |                 |
| San Francisco, CA 94120-7936          |                |                        | ART UNIT              | PAPER NUMBER    |
|                                       |                |                        | 2854                  | ·               |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |
|---|--|---|---|
| •   |  |   |   |
|   | Office Action Summary  | 09/590,641  | MARUYAMA, MASAHIDE  |
|   | emeer todam cumuly   | Examiner  | Art Unit  |
|   | - The MAILING DATE of this communic  | Dan Colilla   | 2854  |
| Period fo   | The MAILING DATE of this communic<br>or Reply  | auon appears on the cover sneet w   | viui the correspondence address   |
| THE N - Exter after: - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC sions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commu period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply we ply received by the Office later than three months after different parts of the part of the polymer. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATION.  f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nication.  days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi ytory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI till. by statute, cause the application to become A | reply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. |
| 1)[   | Responsive to communication(s) file  | d on <i>12 June 2003</i> .  |   |
| 2a)□  |  | D)⊠ This action is non-final.   |   |
| 3)  | Since this application is in condition f   |   | atters prosecution as to the morite is  |
| ,—  | closed in accordance with the practic on of Claims   | e under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.  | D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |
| 4)⊠   | Claim(s) <u>1-9,11,13,14 and 16-20</u> is/ar   | e pending in the application.   |   |
| 4   | la) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are wi   | thdrawn from consideration.   |   |
| 5)  | Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |   |   |
| 6)⊠   | Claim(s) <u>13,14 and 16</u> is/are rejected.  |   |   |
| 7)🖂   | Claim(s) <u>11 and 17-20</u> is/are objected   | to.   |   |
|   | Claim(s) are subject to restriction  Papers  | on and/or election requirement.   |   |
| 9) <u></u> ⊤  | he specification is objected to by the I   | Examiner.   |   |
|   | he drawing(s) filed on <u>08 June 2000</u> is  |   | d to by the Examiner.   |
|   | Applicant may not request that any object  |   |   |
| 11)[] T   | he proposed drawing correction filed o   |   |   |
|   | If approved, corrected drawings are requi  |   |   |
| 12)∐ T  | he oath or declaration is objected to b  | y the Examiner.   |   |
| Priority ur   | nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120  |   |   |
| 13) <b></b>   | Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo   | or foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.   | § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  |
| a)⊠   | All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:  |   |   |
| 1   | I.⊠ Certified copies of the priority do  | cuments have been received.   |   |
| 2   | 2. Certified copies of the priority do   | cuments have been received in A   | pplication No   |
|   | application from the Internati   | the priority documents have been onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |   |
|   | ee the attached detailed Office action f   |   |   |
|   |  |   | § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  |
| 15)∐ Ac   | The translation of the foreign languicknowledgment is made of a claim for  | domestic priority under 35 U.S.C.   | een received.<br>§§ 120 and/or 121.   |
| ttachment(s   |  | _   |   |
| ) 🔲 Notice  | of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO<br>ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pape   | -948) 5) Notice of Ir   | Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)  nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)   |
|   | emark Office   |   |   |

Application/Control Number: 09/590,641

Art Unit: 2854

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Prosecution of this application has been re-opened due to newly made claim objections and newly discovered prior art.

### Claim Objections

2. Claims 11m 13-14, 16-20, are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 11, lines 8 and 10-11, the term "roll-like" has no antecedent basis in the claims.

In claim 11, line 11, it appears that "to" should be removed for proper grammar.

In claim 13, lines 2-3, the phrase, "for detecting a rotation of a paper spool" is indefinite since the detection portion does not detect a rotation of the paper spool.

In claim 13, line 10, it appears that "to" should be removed for proper grammar.

In claim 13, line 12, it appears that "to" should be removed for proper grammar.

In claim 14, lines 2-3, the phrase, "for detecting a rotation of a paper spool" is indefinite since the detection portion does not detect a rotation of the paper spool.

In claim 14, line 10, it appears that "to" should be removed for proper grammar.

In claim 14, line 12, it appears that "to" should be removed for proper grammar.

In claim 14, lines 3-4, "a printing paper" appears to be a double recitation since a printing paper has already been recited.

In claim 16, line 6, the term "roll-like" has no antecedent basis in the claims.

In claim 16, line 7, it appears that "to" should be removed for proper grammar.

In claim 16, line 9, it appears that "to" should be removed for proper grammar.

Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 09/590,641

Art Unit: 2854

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 13-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapscott et al. in view of Takeuchi et al.

With respect to claims 13-14, Tapscott et al. discloses the claimed printer except for the presser portions. Tapscott et al. discloses a printer including a roll-like spool of printing paper 14, a detection portion 50 (shown at one side of the paper in Figure 2 of Tapscott et al.) on the shaft 32 of the printing paper 14, and a detection means 54 for detecting rotation of the spool as shown in Figure 3 of Tapscott et al. Further disclosed by Tapscott et al. is a control means 62 for determining the stopping of the paper roll, and a signal is sent to the operator on this condition (Tapscott et al., col. 7, lines 44-52). Also disclosed is the signaling of the operator when the paper reaches a "low medium" state (Tapscott et al., col. 9, lines 33-55). In this state a warning light is shown to alert the operator. Takeuchi et al. teaches a paper roll for a printer including a spool 4 and presser portions 5 and 5' as shown in Figure 15 of Takeuchi et al. It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Takeuchi et al. with the printer disclosed by Tapscott et al. for the advantage of keeping the edges of the paper aligned as it unreels from the spool.

With respect to claim 16, Tapscott et al. in view of Takeuchi et al. discloses the method of using the above mentioned structure.

Application/Control Number: 09/590,641

Art Unit: 2854

# Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 11 and 17-20 are objected to as containing the above mentioned informalities, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome these informalities to the satisfaction of the examiner.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 11 and 17-20 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter because the prior art of record does not disclose or teach in combination the entire combination of a video printer with a detection portion disposed in a paper spool around which a printing paper is wound and control means for determining, based on the detection of paper spool rotation, whether the paper spool is approaching its end.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan Colilla whose telephone number is (703) 308-2259. The examiner can normally be reached M-F, 8:30-5:30. Faxes regarding this application can be sent to (703) 746-4405.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached at (703)305-6619. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Dan Colilla Primary Examiner Art Unit 2854

on Chill

Page 4

June 30, 2003